

REMARKS

1. The Examiner has rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Particularly the Examiner points out that there is no support in the original disclosure for the tensioning device comprising one or more tensioning screws that threadedly engage both the first and second head members as set forth in claim 2. Rather, support is provided for tensioning screws that threadedly engage only one of the head members.

Applicant has amended Claim 2 accordingly and respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph be withdrawn. No new matter is added.

2. Examiner has rejected claims 4 and 6 -10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Particularly the Examiner asserts as follows:

In claim 4, line 4, "an aperture" is vague and indefinite as to whether it is referring to "an aperture" in claim 1 or to another such aperture, and it seems that "an" should be changed to --said- or the like,

In claim 6, lines 4 - 5, "an aperture" is vague and indefinite as to whether it is referring to "an aperture" in claim 1 or to another such aperture, and it seems that "an" should be changed to --said- or the like.

In claim 7, line 5, "an aperture" is vague and indefinite as to whether it is referring to "an aperture" in claim 1 or to another such aperture, and it seems that "an" should be changed to --said- or the like.

In claim 8, line 5, 'the first head member" is vague and indefinite and appears to be inaccurate, and it seems that "first head member" should be changed to -- tensioned blade- or the like.

In claim 10, line 2, "a bearing face" is vague and indefinite as to whether it is referring to "a face" set forth in claim 8 or to another such face;

In claim 10, line 4, "an aperture" is vague and indefinite as to whether it is referring to "an aperture" in claim 8 or to another such aperture; in general, this claim appears to be substantially redundant with respect to subject matter set forth in claim 8 from which it depends.

Applicant has amended Claims 4, 6, 7 and 8 accordingly. Claim 10 has been cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph be withdrawn. No new matter is added.

3. Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 4 - 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hecker, U.S. Patent No. 1,695,761. Particularly the Examiner asserts that Hecker discloses a cutting head assembly with every structural limitation of the claimed invention.

Applicant has cancelled Claim 10. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include a limitation wherein the cutting member is formed of a strip of material including a thickness in the range of 0.005 inches to 0.0015 inches and a width in the range of 0.375 inches to 0.625 inches. No new matter is added. Applicant submits that the rejection of Claims 1 and 4 - 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hecker, U.S. Patent No. 1,695,761 is therefore moot. Hecker does not disclose a cutting member formed of a strip of material including a width greater than the

thickness of the cutting member, rather Heckler teaches a wire wrapped about the perimeter of a frame.

To constitute a "description" of a patented invention within the meaning of 35 USC § 102(b) the prior publication must describe the invention as claimed in full, clear and exact term so as to allow a person skilled in the art to practice the invention. Vague and general representations are not sufficient to support a defense of anticipation under the law. *Ballantyne Instruments & Electronics, Inc., vs. Wagner*, 345 F.2d 671, 673-74, 145 USPQ 408 (1965). In a rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §102, an applied reference must teach every aspect of the invention, either implicitly, or explicitly. MPEP 706.02. For these reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facia* case for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 should be withdrawn.

4. Examiner has rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hecker, U.S. Patent No. 1,695,761.

Applicant has amended Claim 1, from which Claim 2 depends, as set forth above. Applicant submits that the rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hecker, U.S. Patent No. 1,695,761 is therefore moot. Hecker does not disclose a cutting member formed of a strip of material including a width greater than the thickness of the cutting member, rather Heckler teaches a wire wrapped about the perimeter of a frame.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.


5. Examiner has rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hecker, pn 1,695,761, in view of Stuart, pn 1,868,401.

Applicant has amended Claim 1, from which Claim 3 depends, as set forth above. Applicant submits that the rejection of 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hecker, pn 1,695,761, in view of Stuart, pn 1,868,401 is therefore moot. Neither Hecker nor Stuart disclose a cutting member formed of a strip of material including a width greater than the thickness of the cutting member, rather Heckler and Stuart teach a wire wrapped about or onto a frame.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

6. Applicant believes the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the same. If the Examiner is of a differing opinion he/she is hereby requested to conduct a telephonic interview with the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted.



---

Joseph W. Holland  
Reg. No. 38,919  
(208) 336-1234  
August 14, 2003